UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,126	09/21/2001	David A. Monroe	07-0163	5013

67589 7590 10/02/2009

MOORE LANDREY
1609 SHOAL CREEK BLVD
SUITE 100
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER	
FORD, GRANT M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/960,126	MONROE, DAVID A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GRANT FORD	2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 August 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29,32 and 33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29,32-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/2009, with respect to the prior art of Naidoo failing to disclose "*legacy output data including a serial data string*" have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hackett, as outlined below.

2. Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/2009, with respect to the prior art of Naidoo failing to disclose *"reading the legacy data from the legacy surveillance system via the created socket connection"* have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hite, as outlined below.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/2009 addressing independent claim 33 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that the prior art of Naidoo fails to disclose *"receiving at the intelligent surveillance system server the legacy alert signal from the legacy surveillance system"*. However, Naidoo discloses this limitation at Col. 7 lines 15-27. Regarding Applicant's amendments to independent claim 33, a new grounds of rejection is made in view of Pollard, as outlined below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 29 recites "*... to potentially receive ...*" in the claim. It is unclear whether Applicant intends to claim the receiving, and as such renders the claim indefinite. For purposes of examination, the examiner has examined the claim as not including the word "*potentially*".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-18, 20-21, and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naidoo et al. (US 6,690,411), hereinafter referred to as Naidoo, in view of Hackett et al. (US 5,926,210), hereinafter referred to as Hackett.

a. As per claim 1, Naidoo discloses reading legacy output data, the legacy output data being output from the legacy surveillance system without introducing a signal into the legacy surveillance system (Col. 7 lines 9-27);

transmitting the legacy output data into a data capture application of the intelligent surveillance system without sending a signal to the legacy surveillance system (Col. 7 lines 16-37); and

managing the legacy output data via the intelligent surveillance system (Col. 6 lines 10-13, Col. 7 lines 28-46). However, the prior art of Naidoo fails to explicitly disclose the legacy output data including a serial data string.

Hackett teaches the legacy output data including a serial data string (Col. 7 lines 10-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a legacy output device outputting a serial data string with the prior art system of Naidoo. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of including camera address information within all serial communications both to and from a camera in a monitoring system (Col. 7 lines 10-16).

b. As per claim 2, Naidoo additionally discloses assigning an identifier to the legacy output data for defining a type of legacy surveillance system (Col. 5 lines 41-54).

c. As per claim 3, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein the identifier also identifies a location of the legacy surveillance system (Col. 7 lines 19-27).

d. As per claims 4-5, Naidoo and Hackett teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Naidoo fails to explicitly disclose wherein the reading step comprises reading the legacy output data on a serial/RS232 output port of the legacy surveillance system.

Hackett teaches wherein a legacy surveillance system outputs legacy output data on a RS232 serial output port of the legacy surveillance system (Col. 7 lines 10-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of outputting legacy output data on a RS232 serial port with the prior art of Naidoo. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing communication means between a personal computer and at least one of a plurality of cameras using serial transmission means (Col. 7 lines 1-16).

e. As per claim 6, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein the legacy surveillance system includes a processor having open connectivity to a database wherein the reading step comprises reading the legacy output data into the database (Col. 6 lines 11-13).

f. As per claim 7, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein the intelligent surveillance system includes a server and wherein the legacy surveillance system is driven by legacy software (Col. 5 lines 4-8, Col. 7 lines 9-13), the method further including loading the legacy software in the intelligent surveillance system server (Col. 7 lines 28-45, Col. 9 lines 45-54) and wherein the legacy output data is transmitted to the server and managed by the legacy software (Col. 7 lines 28-45 and Col. 9 lines 40-51), and wherein the reading step includes reading the legacy output data transmitted to the server (Col. 7 lines 28-30 and Col. 9 lines 45-54).

g. As per claim 9, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein the intelligent surveillance system includes a camera activated by an event in a zone of the camera,

and wherein an output signal from the legacy surveillance system in the zone of the camera will activate the camera (Col. 9 lines 40-49).

h. As per claim 10, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein the intelligent surveillance system includes networked appliances responsive to an event, and wherein an output signal from a legacy device will activate an appliance response (Col. 5 lines 41-54 and Col. 9 lines 18-39).

i. As per claim 11, Naidoo additionally discloses a plurality of legacy devices or legacy surveillance systems, each producing a unique legacy output signal, each of which is transmitted to the intelligent surveillance system in the transmitting step (Col. 5 lines 41-54, Col. 9 lines 18-39).

j. As per claim 12, Naidoo additionally discloses assigning a unique identifier to the legacy output data for defining each legacy device or legacy surveillance system (Col. 5 lines 41-54, Col 9 lines 18-39).

k. As per claim 13, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein each unique identifier also identifies a unique location of the legacy device or legacy surveillance system (Col. 5 lines 41-54, Col. 9 lines 18-39).

l. As per claim 14, Naidoo additionally discloses a plurality of legacy systems, each system including a legacy device producing a legacy output signal, and wherein the plurality of legacy systems are not compatible with one another (Col. 5 lines 41-54).

m. As per claim 16, Naidoo discloses an apparatus comprising:

a server associated with the intelligent surveillance system (Col. 5 lines 4-8);

an output port connected to a legacy surveillance system to transmit from the legacy surveillance system a legacy output signal (Col.7 lines 28-45, Col. 9 lines 40-51); and

a transmission channel connected between the output port and the server for transmitting the legacy output signal from the output port to the server without introducing a signal into the legacy surveillance system (Col. 7 lines 9-23). However, the prior art of Naidoo fails to explicitly disclose the legacy output signal including a serial data string.

Hackett teaches the legacy output signal including a serial data string (Col. 7 lines 10-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a legacy output device outputting a serial data string with the prior art system of Naidoo. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of including camera address information within all serial communications both to and from a camera in a monitoring system (Col. 7 lines 10-16).

n. As per claims 17-18, Naidoo and Hackett teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Naidoo fails to explicitly disclose legacy output data on a serial/RS232 output port of the legacy surveillance system.

Hackett teaches wherein a legacy surveillance system outputs legacy output data on a RS232 serial output port of the legacy surveillance system (Col. 7 lines

10-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of outputting legacy output data on a RS232 serial port with the prior art of Naidoo. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing communication means between a personal computer and at least one of a plurality of cameras using serial transmission means (Col. 7 lines 1-16).

o. As per claim 20, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein the legacy device includes open connectivity to a legacy database and wherein the output port receives the legacy output data from the legacy database (Col. 6 lines 11-13).

p. As per claim 21, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein the server is adapted for assigning an identifier to the legacy output signal for identifying the legacy device (Col. 5 lines 41-54, Col. 7 lines 19-27).

q. As per claim 23, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein the intelligent surveillance system includes networked appliances responsive to an event, and wherein an output signal from a legacy device will activate an appliance response (Col. 5 lines 41-54, Col. 9 lines 18-39).

r. As per claim 24, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein the intelligent surveillance system includes a camera activated by an event in a zone of the camera and wherein an output signal from a legacy device in the zone of the camera will activate the camera (Col. 9 lines 40-49).

s. As per claim 25, Naidoo additionally discloses a plurality of legacy devices, each producing a unique legacy output signal, each of which is transmitted to

the intelligent surveillance system by the transmission channel (Col. 5 lines 41-54, Col. 9 lines 18-39).

t. As per claim 26, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein a unique identifier is assigned to each legacy output signal for defining each legacy device (Col. 5 lines 41-54, Col. 9 lines 18-39).

u. As per claim 27, Naidoo additionally discloses wherein each unique identifier also identifies a unique location of the legacy device (Col. 5 lines 41-54, Col. 9 lines 18-39).

v. As per claim 28, Naidoo additionally discloses a plurality of legacy systems, each system including a legacy device producing a legacy output signal, and wherein the plurality of legacy systems are not compatible with one another (Col. 5 lines 41-54).

8. Claims 8 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naidoo and Hackett in view of Kligman (US 2001/0037509).

a. As per claims 8 and 22, Naidoo and Hackett teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Naidoo fails to explicitly disclose wherein the legacy output data is transmitted in the transmitting step via Ethernet.

Kligman teaches wherein surveillance output data is transmitted via ethernet (Para. 0032). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of transmitting surveillance

output data via Ethernet with the prior art combination of Naidoo and Hackett. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of permitting remote viewing of surveillance data across wide area networks such as the Internet (Para. 0032).

9. Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naidoo and Hackett in view of Sloan et al. (US 5,023,901), hereinafter referred to as Sloan.

a. As per claims 15 and 19, Naidoo and Hackett teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Naidoo fails to explicitly disclose wherein the legacy output signal is a printer port output signal.

Sloan teaches wherein a surveillance output signal is a printer port output signal (Col. 2 line 63 through Col. 3 line 6, Col. 18 lines 53-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of printer port output signaling with the prior art combination of Naidoo and Hackett. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of displaying surveillance system data via a printer output (Col. 2 line 63 through Col. 3 line 6, Col. 18 lines 53-55).

10. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naidoo in view of Hite et al. (US 7,213,061), hereinafter referred to as Hite.

a. As per claim 32, Naidoo discloses a method comprising:

associating a database with an intelligent surveillance system (Col. 6 lines 11-13, Col. 7 lines 28-46);

creating a connection to the intelligent surveillance system server from the legacy surveillance system (Col. 6 lines 45-62);

reading the legacy data from the legacy surveillance system (Col. 7 lines 14-46); and

storing the legacy data in the database associated with intelligent surveillance system server (Col. 6 lines 11-13 and Col. 9 lines 40-54). However, the prior art of Naidoo fails to explicitly disclose the use of socket-level connections between an intelligent surveillance system and a legacy surveillance system.

Hite teaches the use of socket-level connections between an intelligent surveillance system and a legacy surveillance system (Figure 10, Col. 8 line 56 through Col. 9 line 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of TCP connections between an intelligent surveillance system and a legacy surveillance system with the prior art of Naidoo. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of connecting control area networks to remotely located computers and databases via the internet (Fig. 10, Abstract, Col. 8 line 56 through Col. 9 line 6).

11. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naidoo in view of Pollard et al. (US 2002/0052708), hereinafter referred to as Pollard.

a. As per claim 33, Naidoo discloses a method for managing in an intelligent surveillance system legacy data from a legacy surveillance system, the legacy data including a legacy alert signal, the intelligent surveillance system including an intelligent surveillance system server, said method comprising:

receiving at the intelligent surveillance system server the legacy alert signal from the legacy surveillance system (Col.7 lines 15-27). However, the prior art of Naidoo fails to explicitly disclose viewing a selected camera, the selected camera being associated with a location of the alert signal, the selected camera being selected for viewing based on proximity of the camera to the location.

Pollard teaches viewing a selected camera, the selected camera being associated with a location of the alert signal, the selected camera being selected for viewing based on proximity of the camera to the location (Para. 0051, 0070). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of selecting a camera for viewing based upon proximity to an alarm with the prior art of Naidoo. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of alerting an operator to an alarm condition thereby allowing the operator to assess an alarm situation (Para. 0070-0071).

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claim 29 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: In interpreting the claim, the examiner finds the claim to be patentably distinct from the prior art of record. Specifically, the examiner points to the input/output port and log testing and verification at each step prior to completion of writing to the log based upon communications between the legacy surveillance system and the log application.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GRANT FORD whose telephone number is (571)272-8630. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30 Mon-Thurs alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442

/G. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2442